UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,030	02/26/2004	Ahmed E. Hassan	42783-0040	2914

	EXAMINER
23577 7590 03/30/2007 RIDOUT & MAYBEE SUITE 2400 ONE QUEEN STREET EAST TORONTO, ON M5C3B1 CANADA	ADDY, ANTHONY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/786,030	HASSAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony S. Addy	2617	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 August 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>15,18-24 and 26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>15,18-24 and 26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/14/2007</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on August 21, 2006.

Claims 1-14, 25 and **28** have been are cancelled. **Claims 15, 18-24** and **26** are

currently pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2.   The indicated allowability of claims **15, 18-24** and **26** is withdrawn in view of the

newly discovered reference(s), **Irvin, U.S. Patent Number 6,56,819, Kipust, U.S.**

Patent Number 6,002,427 and **Bates et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0129283**

to overcome the allowable subject matter in the claims. Rejections based on the newly

cited reference(s) follow.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 14,

2007 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449 form or

PTO/SB/08A and 08B forms).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Fogle et al., U.S. Publication Number 2003/0074590 A1**

(hereinafter Fogle), and further in view of **Bates et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0129283 A1 (hereinafter Bates).**

Regarding claim 15, Fogle teaches a mobile device (see p. 1 [0015] and Fig.1), comprising: a processor (see p. 1 [0015] and Fig.1); at least a first input device connected to the processor for providing input signals thereto (see p. 2 [0018-0020] and Fig.1); and an output device connected to the processor for providing output to a user of the mobile device (see p. 2 [0018-0019] and Fig.1); and a device lock function associated with the processor for implementing restrictions on user access to the mobile device if user input activity for the mobile device falls below a threshold (see p. 3 [0030-0036], p. 3 [0040-0044], p. 5 [0060] and Fig. 1; shows an electronic device 10 including a standby/lock utility 44 [i.e. the standby/lock utility 44 reads on a lock module, since the electronic device 10 uses the standby/lock utility 44 to automatically activate a lock mode when there is no user action or input such as pressing a key on the keyboard 28]), the device lock function being configured for requiring a predetermined user input through the at least one user input device to remove restrictions on user access once they have been implemented (see p. 3 [0030 & 0036]).

Fogle fails to explicitly teach the processor being configured for determining location information for the mobile device based on input signals received from the first input; and the device lock function being configured for changing the predetermined user input required to remove the restrictions on user access in dependence on the determined location information.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Bates teaches a method of restricting access to an electronic device, wherein the electronic device can be enabled only when a geographic-specific password is entered (see abstract). According to Bates, a user stores a geographic-specific password for each of the geographic regions, and when the user travels and wishes to enable the electronic device, the GPS card and antenna receive and process the device's current location, and when the user inputs a password, the electronic device determines if the password is appropriate for the current location, if not access is denied (see abstract, p. 2 [0017] and p. 4 [0035-0037]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fogle with Bates to include a mobile device, wherein the device lock function is configured to change the predetermined user input required to remove the restrictions on user access in dependence on the determined location information, in order to restrict or enable access to an electronic device only when a geographic-specific password is entered taught by Bates (see abstract and p. 1 [0008]).

Regarding claim 18, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of claim 15. Fogle in view of Bates further teaches a mobile device wherein the predetermined user input includes entry of a predetermined password, the device lock function being configured for selecting which of a plurality of predetermined passwords is required to remove the restrictions on user access in dependence on the determined location information (see abstract, p. 2 [0017] and p. 4 [0035-0037]).

Regarding claim 19, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of claim 15. Fogle in view of Bates further teaches a mobile device, wherein the device lock function

is configured for determining the threshold in dependence on the determined location

information (see *Bates,* abstract, p. 2 [0017] and p. 4 [0035-0037]).

Regarding claim 22, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of claim 15.

Fogle in view of Bates further teaches a mobile device, wherein the first input device

includes a GPS receiver (see *Bates,* abstract, p. 3 [0027] and p. 4 [0035]).

Regarding claim 23, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of claim 15.

Fogle in view of Bates further teaches a mobile device, wherein the first input device

includes a wireless communications subsystem connected to the processor for

exchanging communications signals with a wireless network including a plurality of base

stations, the location information being determined based on identities of the base

stations (see *Bates,* abstract, p. 2 [0017], p. 3 [0027] and p. 4 [0035-0037]).

6.   Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Fogle et al., U.S. Publication Number 2003/0074590 A1 (hereinafter Fogle)** and

Bates et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0129283 A1 (hereinafter Bates) as

applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of **Landram et al., U.S. Publication**

Number 2005/0077997 A1 (hereinafter Landram).

Regarding claims 20 and 21, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of

claim 15. Fogle in view of Bates fails to explicitly teach a mobile device, wherein the

first input device includes an interface for docking the mobile device to a desktop

computer, the location information being determined based on whether the mobile

device is docked to the desktop computer and wherein the security setting of the device

lock function is set to mirror that of the desktop computer when the mobile device is docked to the desktop computer.

Landram, however, teaches a mobile terminal allocation system, wherein a cradle provides a docking interface for a respective mobile terminal to communicate with a host computer through a wireless link or via a network connection through the cradle (see p. 2 [0025] and Fig. 1). Landram further teaches the location information of the mobile terminal is determined based on whether the mobile device is docked to the desktop computer and wherein the security setting of the device lock function is set to mirror that of the desktop computer when the mobile device is docked to the desktop computer (see p. 2 [0028-0030] and p. 4 [0067-0069]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fogle and Bates with Landram to include a mobile device, wherein the first input device includes an interface for docking the mobile device to a desktop computer, the location information being determined based on whether the mobile device is docked to the desktop computer and wherein the security setting of the device lock function is set to mirror that of the desktop computer when the mobile device is docked to the desktop computer,, in order to securely store mobile devices allocated to different users and based on authentication results, allow a host computer communicating with the mobile devices through a docking interface to automatically select a mobile device for a user as taught by Landram (see p. 2 [0026]).

7.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fogle et al., U.S. Publication Number 2003/0074590 A1 (hereinafter Fogle)** and **Bates et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0129283 A1 (hereinafter Bates)** as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of **Huang, U.S. Publication Number 2005/0164720 A1 (hereinafter Huang).**

Regarding claim 24, Fogle in view of Bates teaches all the limitations of claim 15. Fogle in view of Bates further teaches the mobile device is enabled for receiving electronic messages (see *Fogle*, p. 2 [0021] and *Bates*, p. 3 [0030]), but fails to explicitly teach the mobile device includes a message filtering module associated with the processor for filtering electronic messages received by the mobile device, the message filtering module being configured for changing filtering criteria for filtering the electronic messages in dependence on the determined location information.

Huang, however, teaches a method of filtering messages received on a receiving telephone apparatus, wherein filtering rules are applied to a received message at the telephone apparatus and if the message satisfies at least one of the filtering rules, a filtering process is then executed on the message (see p. 1 [0007], p. 1 [0014] and Figures 3 & 4).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fogle and Bates with Huang to include a message filtering module associated with the processor for filtering electronic messages received by the mobile device, in order to automatically filter out unwanted messages according to the

filtering rules and prevent the user of the telephone apparatus to manually filter out

unwanted messages as taught by Huang (see p. 1 [0008]).

8.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin,**

U.S. Patent Number 6,56,819 (hereinafter Irvin) and further in view of **Kipust, U.S.**

Patent Number 6,002,427 (hereinafter Kipust).

        Regarding claim 26, Irvin teaches a method for providing security to a mobile

electronic device having a device lock function that restricts use of the mobile electronic

device by a user thereof by locking the electronic device when user interaction with the

mobile device falls below a threshold (see abstract, col. 6, lines 43-63 and Fig. 4), the

method including steps of: receiving input signals from an input device of the mobile

electronic device (see col. 5, lines 1-14 and col. 6, lines 15-24); and determining if the

mobile electronic device is in a secure location based on the input signals (see col. 6,

lines 25-42 and Fig. 4; block 470).

        Irvin fails to explicitly teach applying, if the mobile electronic device is determined

to be in a secure location, a first countdown timer value defining a duration after which

the mobile electronic device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile electronic

device is not detected, and applying, if the mobile electronic device is determined not to

be in a secure location, a second, shorter, countdown timer value defining the duration

after which the mobile electronic device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile

electronic device is not detected.

In an analogous field of endeavor, Kipust teaches a method and a security

system that includes a proximity sensor to protect against unauthorized access to an

electronic device, wherein a first countdown timer value defining a duration after which

the electronic device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile electronic device is

not detected is applied (see col. 7, lines 19-22 and col. 7, lines 36-52), and applying, if

the mobile electronic device is determined not to be in a secure location, a second,

shorter, countdown timer value defining the duration after which the mobile electronic

device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile electronic device is not detected

(see col. 7, lines 19-30 and col. 7, lines 36-52).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to incorporate the teachings of applying a smaller preprogrammed

countdown timer during a stricter security setting of Kipust, to the method of Irvin, to

include a method of applying, if the mobile electronic device is determined to be in a

secure location, a first countdown timer value defining a duration after which the mobile

electronic device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile electronic device is not

detected, and applying, if the mobile electronic device is determined not to be in a

secure location, a second, shorter, countdown timer value defining the duration after

which the mobile electronic device will be locked if user interaction with the mobile

electronic device is not detected, in order to protect against unauthorized use of an

electronic device or access to data stored on the electronic device which involves

minimal routine involvement by the user of the electronic device to invoke the protection

provided by the security system of the electronic device as taught by Kipust (see

abstract and col. 2, lines 16-32).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Bear et al., U.S. Publication Number 2004/0225892 A1 discloses method and

system for activating a computer system.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Anthony S. Addy whose telephone number is 571-272-

7795. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Duc M. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.S.A

DUC M. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600